

In addition, if industry were to agree to the government's requirement to invest in and build a potentially expensive and technically complicated escrow scheme in exchange for the right to export, non-escrow technology could be placed at a disadvantage in the domestic marketplace. Such a development could suppress technological innovation and slow development of more powerful levels of information security.

Finally, we do not think it is necessary to mandate that a number of commercial companies will gain the right to qualify as escrow key agents. We see no reason why organizations could not hold their own keys.

Just as the Cold War dictated that the nation engage in a costly defense against a real threat, so must U.S. industry be allowed to arm itself with encryption protection strong enough to meet the known threat to our industrial and economic security. We look forward to working with the Administration to ensure that the U.S. policy on encryption balances both economic and national security interests.

ITAA represents more than 6,500 members and affiliates throughout the United States. High technology industry segments represented in our membership include software, telecommunications, services, systems integrators and computers. Many of these companies are international and view their markets as global.

Thank you for considering our comments. If you have any questions, please contact me at 703-284-5301 (telephone) or hmiller@itaa.org (e-mail).

Sincerely,

HARRIS N. MILLER,  
President.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
INDUSTRY COUNCIL,  
Washington, DC, October 10, 1995.

Hon. ALBERT GORE, Jr.,  
Office of the Vice President, Old Executive Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am writing on behalf of the Information Technology Industry Council to let you know our views on the Administration's recent encryption proposal. ITI represents the leading U.S. providers of information technology products and services. Our members had worldwide revenue of \$323 billion in 1994 and employ more than one million people in the United States. It is our member companies that are providing much of the hardware, software, and services that are making the "information superhighway" a reality.

ITI applauds your efforts to further develop U.S. policy on export of encryption technologies and your willingness to hear from the private sector on your recent proposal. However, ITI believes the proposal does not adequately meet the needs of industry or users, nor does it sufficiently recognize the importance of information security to economic growth and industrial society in the information age. Specifically, the proposed criteria will restrict users' freedom to choose the encryption that best meets their security needs and the key management system appropriate to those needs, will not allow users to maintain and manage their own keys, ignores the steady improvements in the ability of competitive foreign firms to incorporate strong security features in their products and services, and will be difficult to implement internationally. The proposed interoperability criteria will make it more difficult for domestic users to use non-key escrow encryption in the United States. Systems that do not interoperate are not attractive to domestic and international customers with significant installed bases and are contrary to your own definition of the information superhighway as a "seamless web of

communications networks, computers, databases, and consumer electronics . . .".

It appears that the proposed export criteria are driven solely by the views of law enforcement and national security agencies, without taking into account the needs of commercial users. While law enforcement and national security goals are important, export restrictions that do not reflect marketplace realities may drive U.S. companies to move their encryption work off shore, resulting in the loss of an important domestic technology base, as well as defeating the very purpose of the restrictions.

As you work to finalize the export criteria, we urge you to also immediately decontrol the export of commercial software, at least to allow the export of products including the Data Encryption Standard (DES), which has become the global standard for business and personal use.

We are further concerned about the accelerated effort to develop Federal key escrow standards. The Federal Information Processing Standards appear designed to establish de facto private sector computer security standards. FIPS, which are designed to meet specific government needs, should not drive national policy on information infrastructure, law enforcement, security, and export control. With so many fast-breaking commercial developments in this area, it is far from clear what technologies will emerge from the marketplace. If the FIPS process proceeds too quickly, the government may end up adopting standards that are incompatible with those used in international commercial markets.

ITI looks forward to working with the Administration to develop a national cryptography policy that provides law enforcement and national security agencies with due process access, but which also meets the interoperable security needs of the GII. ITI is continuing to develop specific comments on the proposed export criteria, which we will detail in a follow-up letter to your staff. In the meantime, we hope you will consider these comments as you continue to refine your encryption proposals.

Sincerely,

RHETT DAWSON,  
President.

#### AN INDEPENDENT KHALISTAN

#### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1995

MR. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform my colleagues, the American people, and the international community about the recent surge of activity that has occurred in this town regarding the Sikh struggle for an independent Khalistan.

On October 19, 1995, 65 Members of Congress signed a letter to Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao demanding the release of Sikh human rights activist Jaswant Singh Khalsa. Mr. Khalsa was abducted by Indian police in front of his home on September 6. It appears that Mr. Khalsa represents a threat to the Indian Government because he had recently published a report in which he estimated that Indian police in Punjab, working under the direction of the Indian Government, had abducted murdered, and cremated over 25,000 Sikhs. Sikhs have long accused the Indian police in Punjab of conducting their terror campaign against the Sikhs according to this *modus operandi*. Mr. Khalsa confirmed these

accusations by tallying up the so-called unidentified bodies registered in municipal cremation grounds throughout Punjab. It should be known that in Punjab, family networks are extremely tight which would leave rare occasion for someone to die and not have the body identified by the next of kin. In the Amritsar District alone, Mr. Khalsa found 6,017 unidentified bodies registered in the municipal crematorium. These findings seem to support Mr. Khalsa's claim that the Punjab police have been killing Sikh and cremating their remains as unidentified bodies in order to erase any evidence of police wrongdoing. Under these circumstances we can understand why Amnesty International states in its latest report, "Determining the Fate of the 'Disappeared in Punjab,'" that "the Punjab Police have been allowed to commit human rights violations with impunity."

As a result of the letter of the 65 Members of Congress, President Clinton wrote a letter to Congressman GARY CONDIT, the initiator of the letter to express that he, too, is "concerned by reports regarding Jaswant Singh Khalsa." The President stated that the "U.S. Embassy in New Delhi has already made inquiries into these allegations with various Indian Government agencies, and Ambassador Wisner has raised the issue with high-ranking officials."

Turning up the pressure on India even further, Congressman CONDIT is sending a letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations, Boutros-Boutros Ghali, in which he asks the United Nations to "issue a strong statement condemning the murders of over 25,000 Sikhs" and to "demand the release of Mr. Khalsa by India immediately."

The media has been watching the congressional activity on behalf of the Sikhs closely. The November 28 issue of the Washington Times ran an article titled, "Clinton checks India", reporting on President Clinton's condemnation of India's abduction of Mr. Khalsa. On November 3, the Washington Times also reported on an encounter between Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan and Indian Ambassador S.S. Ray which occurred in the halls of the Longworth House Office Building. Dr. Aulakh, the article reports, "blames Mr. Ray for widespread human rights abuses when the ambassador was Governor of Punjab in the late 1980's. During that time thousands died in violence linked to Sikh demands for a separate homeland." When Dr. Aulakh encountered Mr. Ray in the Longworth building, he did not hesitate to speak his mind. As the article quotes Dr. Aulakh: "I walked up to him and told him, 'You are a murderer and should not be walking these halls.'"

The efforts of Dr. Aulakh and the Council of Khalistan on behalf of the Sikh nation in its struggle for freedom from India have been highly successful. According to News India-Times, "Sikh Nation activists led by Gurmit Singh Aulakh perhaps pose the biggest challenge and threat to India's lobbying efforts in the capital." Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the reason for the success of the Sikh nation in the U.S. Congress is due half in part by extremely hard work on the part of the Sikhs and half in part to the fact that evidence against India is so overwhelming. Though it claims to be a democracy, India is one of the most brutal regimes in the world regarding its dealings with minority nations and people under its rule.

Against the efforts of India's lobbying machine Dr. Aulakh, has been able to highlight this fact. India-West, November 10, has reported that there is speculation that Ambassador S.S. Ray may be recalled back to New Delhi. This is due in part to his ineffectiveness at counter-ing issues exposed by Dr. Aulakh. Perhaps Mr. Ray is not to blame. It appears that truth is on the side of the Sikh nation and the time has come for India to cease its oppression of the Sikhs and honor their right of freedom.

I submit for the RECORD material pertinent to the recent congressional activity in favor of the struggle for Sikh freedom.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Washington, DC, October 19, 1995.

Hon. P.V. NARASHIMA RAO,  
Prime Minister of India, Chankaya Puri, New  
Delhi, India.

DEAR PRIME MINISTER RAO: According to an Amnesty International "Urgent Action" bulletin issued on September 7, Punjab police abducted Sikh human rights activist Jaswant Singh Khalra from his home in Amritsar on September 6. His whereabouts are unknown. As the general secretary of Human Rights Wing (Shiromani Akali Dal), Mr. Khalra had published a report showing that the Punjab police have arrested more than 25,000 young Sikh men, tortured them, murdered them, then declared them "unidentified" and cremated their bodies. These atrocities are intolerable in any country, especially one that calls itself a democracy. After the report was published, Mr. Khalra was told by the Amritsar district police chief, "We have made 25,000 disappear. It would be easy to make one more disappear." This abuse of police power is inexcusable.

The right to speak out and expose atrocities is one of the most fundamental rights of free individuals. As long as Mr. Khalra remains in detention, how can anyone in India feel secure exercising his or her democratic liberties?

Many of us wrote to you previously urging that the passports of Sikh leader Samranjit Singh Mann and Dalit ("black untouchable") leader V.T. Rajshekar be restored. Your government has not acted, and Mr. Mann and Mr. Rajshekar remain unable to travel. The right to travel is fundamental to a democratic nation.

Mr. Prime Minister, we call upon your government to release Mr. Khalra immediately. We also urge you to restore the passports of Mr. Rajshekar and Mr. Mann. If India is a democratic country, it must end these gross violations of human rights and democratic principles. Only then can democracy truly begin to flower. We await your response.

Sincerely,

Gary A. Condit, M.C.; James A. Traficant, M.C.; William Jefferson, M.C.; Peter King, M.C.; Randy "Duke" Cunningham, M.C.; Roscoe Bartlett, M.C.; Jack Fields, M.C.; Donald M. Payne, M.C.; Dan Burton, M.C.; Phil Crane, M.C.; Richard Pombo, M.C.; Karen McCarthy, M.C.; Neil Abercrombie, M.C.; Wally Herger, M.C.; Dana Rohrabacher, M.C.; Esteban Torres, M.C.; Ronald V. Dellums, M.C.; John T. Doolittle, M.C.; Michael Forbes, M.C.; Enid G. Waldholtz, M.C.; Gil Gutknecht, M.C.; Victor Frazer, M.C.; John Porter, M.C.; Sam Gejdenson, M.C.; Bob Livingston, M.C.; Edolphus Towns, M.C.; Chris Smith, M.C.; William O. Lipinski, M.C.; Scott Klug, M.C.; Lincoln Diaz-Balart, M.C.; Dick Zimmer, M.C.; Collin Peterson, M.C.; Pete Geren, M.C.; Joe Skeen, M.C.; Duncan Hunter, M.C.; Jim Ramstad, M.C.; Floyd Flake, M.C.; Bernie Sand-

ers, M.C.; Matt Salmon, M.C.; Richard "Doc" Hastings, M.C.; Ileana Ros-Lehtiner, M.C.; Phil English, M.C.; Richard Burr, M.C.; Connie Morella, M.C.; Carlos Romero-Barcelo, M.C.; Sanford D. Bishop, M.C.; Jim Moran, M.C.; Martin R. Hoke, M.C.; Jack Metcalf, M.C.; Amo Houghton, M.C.; Jerry Solomon, M.C.; Robert Torricelli, M.C.; Ed Whitfield, M.C.; Melvin L. Watt, M.C.; Jim Kolbe, M.C.; John Shadegg, M.C.; J.D. Hayworth, M.C.; James H. Quillen, M.C.; Barbara Cubin, M.C.; Charlie Norwood, M.C.; Vic Fazio, M.C.; Chris Cox, M.C.; Joe Scarborough, M.C.; Bill Richardson, M.C.; Steve Schiff, M.C.

COUNCIL OF KHALISTAN,  
Washington, DC.

U.S. CONGRESS DEMANDS RELEASE OF  
KHALRA, MURDERS OF OVER 25,000 SIKHS EX-  
POSED

WASHINGTON, October 20.—A bipartisan group of 65 Members of Congress today wrote to Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao demanding that Sikh human rights activist Jaswant Singh Khalra, the general secretary of the Human Rights Wing (Shiromani Akali Dal) be released. Khalra was abducted by Amritsar police on September 6 after he issued a report showing that the Indian regime has abducted more than 25,000 young Sikh men, tortured them, murdered them, declared their bodies "unidentified" and cremated them. "After the report was published," the letter says, "Mr. Khalra was told by the Amritsar district police chief, 'We have made 25,000 disappear. It would be easy to make one more disappear.'"

The letter was initiated by Rep. Gary Condit (D-Cal.), ranking member of an Agriculture subcommittee and a longtime supporter of Sikh freedom. *It carried more signatures than any previous letter concerning Indian tyranny.* Signers of the letter include members of the leadership of both parties such as Rep. Gerald Solomon, chairman of the powerful House Rules Committee; Appropriations Committee chairman Rep. Robert Livingston (R-La.); Rep. Christopher H. Smith (R-NJ), chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights; Rep. Ronald Dellums (D-Cal.), ranking minority member of the National Security Committee; Congressional Black Caucus chairman Donald Payne (D-NJ); Rep. Philip M. Crane (R-Ill.), chairman of the Ways and Means subcommittee on Trade; Rep. Vic Fazio (D-Cal), chairman of the Democratic Caucus; Rep. Dan Burton (R-Ind), chairman of the Southern Hemisphere subcommittee and a longtime friend of the Sikh nation; and other prominent members too numerous to list.

"These atrocities are unacceptable in any country," the letter says, "especially one that calls itself a democracy." India has not only murdered more than 120,000 Sikhs since 1984, it has also killed over 200,000 Christians in Nagaland since 1947, over 43,000 Kashmiri Muslims since 1988, tens of thousands of Assamese, Manipuris, and others, and thousands of Dalits ("black untouchables"). "Disappearances" like M. Khalra's are routine.

"The right to speak out and expose atrocities is one of the most fundamental rights of free individuals," the letter says. "As long as Mr. Khalra remains in detention, how can anyone in India feel secure exercising his or her democratic rights?" It goes on to say, "If India is a democratic country, it must end these gross violations of human rights and democratic principles. Only then can democracy truly begin to flower."

"The Sikh nation thanks these freedom-loving Members of Congress for their support of Mr. Khalra's freedom," said Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan. "Mr. Khalra has been made to 'disappear' because he exposed India's brutal tyranny against the Sikh nation," he said. "The Sikh nation can no longer suffer under this brutal regime. The time has come to start a *shantmai morcha* (peaceful agitation) to liberate Khalistan," Dr. Aulakh said. Khalistan is the independent Sikh country declared on October 7, 1987. "It is time for India to recognize the inevitable and get out of Khalistan. Democratic principles demand it."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, November 27, 1995.

Hon. BOUTROS-BOUTROS GHALI,  
Secretary General of the United Nations, United  
Nations Headquarters, New York, NY.

DEAR SECRETARY GENERAL GHALI: While I am pleased that the United Nations took such strong action to condemn Nigeria for its execution of nine political activists, I am concerned that repression in other regions of the world continues to go unnoticed. Specifically, human rights abuses in India have been prevalent and must cease.

Earlier this year, Jaswant Singh Khalra, general secretary of the Human Rights Wing (Shiromani Akali Dal), issued a report showing that over 25,000 young Sikh men have been kidnapped by the Indian government, tortured and killed. His report detailed how their bodies were then listed as "unidentified" and cremated to cover up police responsibility. These young Sikhs are among more than 150,000 Sikhs murdered by the Indian government in Punjab, Khalistan since 1984. For this, Mr. Khalra was abducted by the police in Amritsar on September 6. His whereabouts remain unknown. Mr. Khalra had been previously told by the Amritsar police chief that "it would not be hard to make one more disappear." In an Urgent Action bulletin issued on September 7, Amnesty International expressed fear that he may be made to "disappear" and tortured.

On October 19, sixty-five members of the U.S. Congress, including myself, wrote to Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narashima Rao demanding the release of Mr. Khalra. I am enclosing a copy of that letter. No action has been taken. We are concerned that Mr. Khalra will simply become one more victim of Indian "democracy." I am also enclosing recent correspondence I received from President Clinton expressing his concern about this situation.

In light of your action against the Nigerian government, it is hypocritical for the United Nations to turn a blind eye to India's tyranny. I call upon you to take strong action against India. Specifically, I ask that the United Nations issue a strong statement condemning the murders of over 25,000 Sikhs and that the United Nations demand the release of Mr. Khalra by India immediately.

It is incumbent upon the U.N. under the United Nations charter to defend basic human rights. Freedom is the universal right of all peoples and nations. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

GARY A. CONDIT,  
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
Washington, November 15, 1995.

Representative GARY A. CONDIT,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CONDIT: Thank you for sharing with me your recent letter to Prime Minister Rao of India regarding the situation in Punjab.

I, too, am concerned by the reports regarding Jaswant Singh Khalsa. The U.S. Embassy in New Delhi has already made inquiries into these allegations with various Indian government agencies, and Ambassador Wisner has raised the issue with high-ranking Indian officials. We will continue these efforts. I appreciate your interest and concern on this issue.

With best wishes and warm regards.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

[From India Abroad, Dec. 1, 1995]

CLINTON "CONCERNED" BY PRO-KHALISTANI'S ARREST

(By Aziz Haniffa)

WASHINGTON.—In a letter that is likely to ignite yet another controversy in Indo-U.S. political and diplomatic relations, President Clinton has said that he shares the concern of several pro-Khalistani legislators over the abduction of a Sikh human rights activist.

In a missive to Rep. Gary Condit, Democrat from California, who has publicly endorsed the concept of a separate state of Khalistan, Clinton said, "I, too, am concerned by the reports regarding Jaswant Singh Khalsa," the general secretary of the Human Rights Wing (Shiromani Akali Dal).

The President, while thanking Condit "for sharing with me your recent letter to Prime Minister (Narasimha) Rao of India regarding the situation in Punjab," said that "the U.S. Embassy in New Delhi has already made inquiries into these allegations with various Indian government agencies, and Ambassador Wisner has raised the issue with high-ranking Indian officials." "We will continue these efforts," Clinton promised Condit, and informed the legislator that he appreciated "your interest and concern on the issue."

Last month, Condit initiated a letter to Rao that was co-signed by a bipartisan group of 64 other legislators that demanded that Khalsa be released.

The letter to Rao, a copy of which was sent to Clinton, said that according to Amnesty International's "Urgent Action" bulletin issued on Sept. 7, Punjab police had abducted Khalsa from his home in Amritsar on Sept. 6, and his whereabouts were unknown.

The letter, written at the urging of the Council of Khalistan, the leading pro-Khalistan lobbying group in the United States, headed by Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, noted that Khalsa had published a report showing that the Punjab police have arrested more than 25,000 young Sikh men, tortured them, murdered them, then declared them "unidentified" and cremated their bodies.

The letter by the 65 legislators to Rao said, "These atrocities are intolerable in any country, especially one that calls itself a democracy."

It said that after Khalsa's report was published he had been told by the Amritsar district police chief, "We have made 25,000 disappear (and) it would be easy to make one more disappear."

The lawmakers told Rao that "this abuse of police power is inexcusable."

"The right to speak out and expose atrocities is one of the most fundamental rights of free individuals," they said and asserted that "as long as Mr. Khalsa remains in detention, how can anyone in India feel secure exercising his or her democratic liberties?"

They noted that several of them had written to Rao previously urging that the passports of Sikh leader Simranjit Singh Mann and Dalit leader V.T. Rajshekar be restored.

The letter to Rao, which was then passed on to Clinton, carried more signatures than any previous letter the Council of Khalistan has been able to muster in its over 10 years of lobbying Congress, and included members

of the leadership of both parties such as Reps. Gerald Solomon, Republican from New York who chairs the House Rules Committee; Robert Livingston, Republican from Louisiana, chairman of the Appropriations Committee; Christopher Smith, Republican from New Jersey, chairman of the House International Relations Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights; Ronald Dellums, Democrat from California, ranking minority member of the National Security Committee; Donald Payne, Democrat from New Jersey, chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus; Philip Crane, Republican from Illinois, chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade; and Vic Fazio, Democrat from California, chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Aulakh was elected over Clinton's expression of concern in his letter to Condit, saying, "President Clinton's letter once again exposes the Indian regime's true face and explodes the myth of Indian democracy."

"We appreciate the support of President Clinton in this issue," Aulakh declared. "India cannot withstand this kind of pressure. This scrutiny should make the regime release Mr. Khalsa soon."

Diplomatic observers acknowledged that Clinton's expression of concern in reply to a letter from a pro-Khalistani legislator, and an assurance that his Ambassador to India was looking into the matter, was a clear indication that the pro-Khalistanis in the U.S. had scored another coup in terms of trying to embarrass New Delhi.

One diplomatic observer noted that, when Punjab Chief Minister Beant Singh was assassinated Aug. 31, Clinton had not publicly condemned the killing nor had the White House or the State Department issued any statement. It was left to Indian correspondents here to elicit a statement out of a spokesman for the South Asia Bureau, saying that the U.S. regrets "the lives lost" and that Washington deplores "this senseless act of violence."

Even then, the spokesman refused to assign any blame to Sikh terrorists, saying the Administration had seen only news reports about the murder and had no information on whether it was a terrorist act.

Later in the week, Condit, obviously buoyed by the letter from Clinton and egged on by the Council of Khalistan, also wrote to U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali calling for U.N. intervention to seek the release of Khalsa.

He urged the U.N. to "take strong action against India, and wrote specifically that the U.N." issue a strong statement condemning the murders of over 25,000 Sikhs and that the United Nations demand the release of Mr. Khalsa by India immediately." In his message to the U.N. Secretary-General, Condit also enclosed a copy of the Oct. 19 letter he and 64 other U.S. legislators wrote to Rao regarding Khalsa.

Condit also enclosed a copy of the letter he received from Clinton expressing his concern about Khalsa's case.

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 28, 1995]

CLINTON CHECKS INDIA

(By James Morrison)

President Clinton has taken a personal interest in the fate of an Indian human rights activist held by the government in New Delhi.

Following a letter-writing campaign from 65 members of Congress, Mr. Clinton says his envoy to India has made inquiries into the fate of Jaswant Singh Khalsa.

U.S. Ambassador Frank Wisner has made it known in New Delhi that Washington is watching.

"I, too, am concerned by the reports regarding Jaswant Singh Khalsa," Mr. Clinton wrote this month to Rep. Gary A. Condit.

The California Democrat organized the congressional letter to Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao, a copy of which was sent to the White House.

Mr. Condit cited an Amnesty International bulletin of Sept. 7 that accused Indian police of abducting Mr. Khalsa for investigating accusations that police in Punjab murdered thousands of Sikh men.

"The U.S. Embassy in New Delhi has already made inquiries into these allegations with various Indian government agencies, and Ambassador Wisner has raised the issue with high-ranking Indian officials," Mr. Clinton wrote.

"We will continue these efforts."

Mr. Condit's letter to the Indian prime minister noted that Mr. Khalsa "had published a report showing that the Punjab police have arrested more than 25,000 young Sikh men, tortured them, murdered them, then declared them 'unidentified' and cremated their bodies."

"These atrocities are intolerable in any country, especially one that calls itself a democracy. \* \* \*

"This abuse of police power is inexcusable."

The congressional letter was the product of effective lobbying by Gurmit Singh Aulakh of the Council of Khalistan, which represents Sikhs pressing for a separate homeland.

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 3, 1995]

"MURDERER," HE CRIED

(By James Morrison)

Whatever the Indian Embassy might think of Gurmit Singh Aulakh, it would agree he is not a shy man.

Consider a recent encounter with Indian Ambassador Siddhartha Shankar Ray.

Mr. Aulakh, a leader of Sikh expatriates, spotted Mr. Ray in the Longworth House Office Building one day last month.

"I walked up to him and told him, 'You are a murderer and you should not be walking these halls,'" Mr. Aulakh said, describing the brief confrontation.

Mr. Aulakh, president of the Council of Khalistan, blames Mr. Ray for widespread human rights abuses when the ambassador was governor of the Indian state of Punjab in the late 1980s. During that time thousands died in violence linked to Sikh demands for a separate homeland.

Mr. Ray could not be reached for comment yesterday.

Mr. Aulakh has most recently been busy on two fronts directed at India.

He is organizing a rally scheduled for tomorrow at noon in Lafayette Park to march on the Indian Embassy on the anniversary of a 1984 confrontation in Delhi in which thousands of Sikhs were killed.

Mr. Aulakh has also been publicizing a letter signed by 65 members of Congress, calling on Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao to release Sikh human rights activist Jaswant Singh Khalsa. The letter cites an Amnesty International bulletin of Sept. 7, accusing Indian police of abducting Mr. Khalsa.

Mr. Khalsa "had published a report showing that the Punjab police have arrested more than 25,000 young Sikh men, tortured them, murdered them, then declared them 'unidentified' and cremated their bodies," the letter said.

"These atrocities are intolerable in any country, especially one that calls itself a democracy. . . . This abuse of police power is inexcusable."

The letter, organized by Rep. Gary Condit, California Democrat, drew wide bipartisan congressional support, from lawmakers including conservative Republican Dan Burton of Indiana, liberal Democrat Ronald Dellums

of California and socialist independent Bernard Sanders of Vermont.

[From the News India-Times, Nov. 10, 1995]

#### BIGGEST THREAT TO LOBBYING EFFORTS

WASHINGTON.—“Sikh nation” activists led by Gurmit Singh Aulakh perhaps pose the biggest challenge and threat to India’s lobbying efforts in the capital, only next to the anti-India campaign funded by pro-Pakistan forces.

Aulakh got some print mileage last week in the conservative daily paper, Washington Times, which promptly published his offensive “encounter” with his bete noir, none other than the Indian ambassador to the US, Siddhartha Shankar Ray. The juicy part of the report is that Aulakh called Ray “a murderer.”

According to the paper, Aulakh, “a leader of Sikh expatriates”, spotted Ray in the Longworth House Office Building one day last month. “I walked up to him and told him, you are a murderer and you should not be walking these halls,” Aulakh told the paper describing his brief confrontation.

Aulakh, president of the Council of Khalistan, blames Ray for “widespread human rights abuses” when the ambassador was governor of Punjab in the late 1980s. “During that time thousands died in violence linked to Sikh demands for a separate land,” the paper said in its “embassy row” column, adding that “Ray could not be reached for comment.”

News India-Times learned that Ray, who was caught unawares by the intruder, had reportedly shot back, “Who are you?” Later an escort took Aulakh aside and asked him not to spoil the Hill meeting scheduled by Ray.

The Washington Times further said that Aulakh was organizing a rally in front of the White House at Lafayette Park on Nov. 4, culminating in a march to the Indian Embassy on the anniversary of a 1984 confrontation in Delhi in which thousands of Sikhs were killed.

Aulakh has also been publicizing a letter signed by 65 members of US Congress, calling on Indian Prime Minister Narasimha Rao to release “Sikh human rights activist” Jaswant Singh Khalra. The letter cites an Amnesty International bulletin of September 7, accusing Indian police of abducting Khalra.

Khalra “had published a report showing that the Punjab police have arrested more than 25,000 young Sikh men, tortured them, murdered them, then declared them unidentified and cremated their bodies,” the letter said.

“These atrocities are intolerable in any country, especially one that calls itself a democracy. . . . This abuse of police power is inexcusable.”

The letter, organized by Rep. Gary Condit, California Democrat, drew wide bipartisan congressional support, from lawmakers including conservative Republican Dan Burton of Indiana, liberal Democrat Ronald Dellums of California and socialist independent Bernard Sanders of Vermont.

The anti-India signature drive by the Council of Khalistan in terms of the number of lawmakers on the Hill it had mobilized, was simply too big to be overwhelmed by a pro-India signature drive such as the one mobilized by the India Caucus against the Brown amendment as only 40 house members had signed the caucus letter.

#### THE 54TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DAY OF INFAMY

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 7, 1995*

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no American of my generation who does not recall where they were and what they were doing 54 years ago today.

On that day—which President Franklin D. Roosevelt labelled “a day which will live in infamy”—aircraft of the Japanese Empire staged a surprise attack on the army and naval forces stationed at Pearl Harbor, HI.

Striking without warning at 7:55 a.m. local time, the Japanese forces succeeded in sinking or severely damaging 19 of our naval vessels, including three battleships—the *West Virginia*, the *California*, and the *Arizona*. A fourth battleship—the *Oklahoma*—was capsized and a fifth—the *Nevada*—sustained heavy damage during a second strike by Japanese forces about an hour after the first. This second strike also succeeded in reducing three additional destroyers to wrecks.

Ninety-seven army airplanes and eighty naval aircraft were also destroyed by the Japanese in the attack, most of which while still on the ground at nearby Hickam and Wheeler fields.

The unexpected, immoral attack by Japan, which took place at the exact minute that peace negotiations were taking place in Washington, claimed the lives of over 2,000 men and women in the U.S. Navy, over 200 Army personnel, and 49 civilians.

As was the case with the bombardment of Fort Sumter for an earlier generation, and the assassination of President John F. Kennedy at a later time, the attack on Pearl Harbor radically altered the lives of millions of Americans and also changed the direction which our Nation had been following.

Prior to Pearl Harbor, the general attitude of millions of Americans was that the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans formed a great natural defense against any and all enemies. Accordingly, it was not only unnecessary but also undesirable for the United States to involve itself in international affairs under any circumstances. Such highly respected Americans as the aviator and national hero Charles A. Lindbergh, former U.S. President Herbert Hoover, and newspaper publisher Robert R. McCormick had for months publicly denounced any American involvement in World War II and received a great deal of support and acclaim from the American people for doing so. When the bombs fell on Pearl Harbor, all support for this point of view virtually evaporated overnight. All Americans put their prior political beliefs aside and joined in a united front to win the war in a manner of national unity never experienced by the American people before or since.

Although there has been great national debate on many important issues throughout the 54 years since the Day of Infamy, including the current ongoing debate regarding our involvement in Bosnia, never since Pearl Harbor has any American seriously suggested that our Nation completely withdraw from the international stage and depend upon the vastness of the oceans for our security. Although there have been many debates regarding our defense posture, never since Pearl Harbor has

anyone suggested that our military be dismantled.

The more than 2,400 military and naval personnel who gave their lives the morning of December 7, 1941, were joined by thousands more who made the supreme sacrifice in the European and Pacific theaters of World War II. Thousands of more courageous veterans risked and gave their lives in Korea, in Southeast Asia, and in the Persian Gulf. Thousands more are now being put into harm’s way in Bosnia. The courage and valor of our veterans has never been questioned throughout the 54 years since the Day of Infamy.

Some observers at the time, in numbers which have increased in frequency and in shrillness since Pearl Harbor, have contended that President Roosevelt was duplicitous in his foreign policy, and in fact knew that the attack on Pearl Harbor was coming. These partisan revisionists contend that the President wanted the disaster to take place at Pearl Harbor to unite the American people into fighting World War II.

These slanderous contentions against President Roosevelt are not only totally lacking in any supporting evidence, they also fly in the face of the massive historic evidence which is at our disposal. In all of his public statements at the time, in his private conferences with Winston Churchill and others which were made public after his death, and in private correspondence which is only now coming to light, President Roosevelt made it clear that his top priority was defeating Hitler and the Nazi hordes which had overrun Europe and North Africa. The last thing in the world President Roosevelt wanted was a war in the Pacific which would divert American attention and energies from defeating Nazi Germany.

In fact, in the days following Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt fretted over how he could unite the American people against Hitler when all of our rage and energies were concentrated against the Japanese. Hitler himself solved this problem for Roosevelt when he declared war against the United States within a week. Recently, historians have argued that, if Hitler were smart enough to restrain from declaring war on us, it is conceivable that our anger against the Japanese would have prevented our ever entering the war in Europe.

In any case, there are none of us who can dispute that Pearl Harbor altered our Nation and each of our individual lives in ways that none of us could foresee 54 years ago.

Today, on December 7, it is the responsibility of those of us who remember that perfidious attack to remind younger generations of the valuable lessons we learned. We learned that we must never again give the perception of a weak defense posture. We learned that we cannot live isolated from the world. We also learned that, when threatened, the American people can act with unity and vigor in a manner unheard of in all previous history.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to join in reflecting on the meaning of this most significant of all days in our history.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. TILLIE K. FOWLER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 7, 1995*

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in the family, I was not present for rollcall vote